



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,428	08/16/2001	Yihsiu Chen	2000-0373	2904
7590	09/21/2005		EXAMINER	
Samuel H. Dworesky			CHO, HONG SOL	
AT&T CORP				
P.O. Box 4110			ART UNIT	
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110			PAPER NUMBER	
			2662	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,428

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Hong Cho

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 7/18/2005. Claim 4 is canceled. Claims 1-3 and 5-19 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cruickshank (US 6816468).

Re claim 1, Cruickshank discloses a teleconferencing system allowing data communication with a data network (*providing conference call set-up capabilities using a data network from a communications device without voice network conferencing capabilities*, column 2, lines 18-21). Cruickshank discloses a computer/telephony system in communication with a voice and a data network (*providing voice and data communication paths from voice and data communication networks to an individual's communications device*, figure 1). Cruickshank discloses teleconference bridge server

and audio bridge between PBX and a computer/telephony system (*providing a teleconference platform coupled between a communication device and a teleconference-enabled switch in the voice communication network*, figure 1, column 2, lines 24-35).

Cruickshank discloses audio bridge (*a network controlling server/a computer/telephony interface server*) translating teleconference commands from the data communication network into telephony-based teleconferencing commands and transmitting the telephony-based teleconference commands via the voice and data communication network to the teleconference-enabled switch (column 5, lines 32-35; column 9, lines 17-26). Cruickshank discloses teleconference bridge server routing a call from a caller to PBX (*in response to a teleconference set-up command received at the teleconference platform from communications device via the data communications network, forwarding the data-to-telephony translated set-up command to the teleconference-enabled switch*, column 9, lines 17-23).

Re claim 2, Cruickshank discloses transmitting a call through voice communication network (*in response to receiving the set-up command at the teleconference-enabled switch, extending outbound calls over the voice communication network to conference call participants*, column 9, lines 24-26) and bridging the outbound calls together to form a conference call (column 10, lines 34-37).

Re claims 5, 15 and 19, Cruickshank discloses audio bridge (*a network controlling server/a computer/telephony interface server*) translating teleconference commands from the data communication network into telephony-based teleconferencing commands and transmitting the telephony-based teleconference commands via the voice

and data communication network to the teleconference-enabled switch (column 5, lines 32-35; column 9, lines 17-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 6-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cruickshank in view of Szurkowski (US 6417933).

Re claims 3 and 16, Cruickshank discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to provide a database of directory listings at the teleconferencing platform in communication with the network-controlling server including individual and group listings of names and telephone numbers to facilitate the selection of participants for a teleconference call. Szurkowski discloses a teleconferencing server with administrator processor containing names and phone numbers of conference attendees (figure 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cruickshank to include a database of directory listings for conference attendees so that Cruickshank's teleconference bridge server can provide

secure teleconferencing by facilitating teleconference calls only for numbers listed in the directory.

Re claim 6, Cruickshank discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to provide a scheduling element at the teleconferencing platform for retrieving requested conference call time and listing of participants associated with the teleconference command and scheduling the teleconference call, in response to a teleconference command request received from a remotely located user. Szurkowski discloses administrative processor in teleconferencing server informing voice bridge of teleconference schedules including the time for each teleconference (column 3, lines 18-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cruickshank to include administrative processor of Szurkowski to schedule teleconference call requested by a client at remote site. The motivation is to manage a teleconference call efficiently by reserving a specific telephone number and time of the teleconference.

Re claims 7 and 11-14, Cruickshank discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to provide a notification element at the teleconferencing platform for notifying each participant of the time and data for the conference call over the voice network by way of paging, voicemail and a fax. Szurkowski discloses a teleconference server comprising of voice bridge, facsimile bridge and paging communications sever (figure 1; column 3, lines 13-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Szurkowski to perform the function of notification of time and data for the conference call over the

voice network of Cruickshank by using paging, voicemail and a fax server. The motivation is to reach scattered participants of a teleconference call with diverse communications devices in order to meet their communication requirements for contact preferences.

Re claims 8-10, Cruickshank discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to send notification over the data communications network to at least one participant by way of an email and instant messaging. Szurkowski discloses a teleconference server comprising of email processor (figure 1, element 139). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Szurkowski to perform the function of notification of time and data for the conference call over the data network of Cruickshank by using an email server. The motivation is to reach scattered participants of a teleconference call with diverse communications devices in order to meet their communication requirements for contact preferences.

Re claim 17, Cruickshank discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to provide a scheduling element for storing requests for conference call time and a participant listing for each stored request and a notification element for sending a conference call alert to each participant included in the participant listing. Szurkowski discloses administrative processor in teleconferencing server informing voice bridge of teleconference schedules including the time for each teleconference (column 3, lines 18-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cruickshank to include administrative processor of

Szurkowski to schedule and notify teleconference call requested by a client at remote site.

The motivation is to manage a teleconference call efficiently by reserving a specific telephone number and time of the teleconference and to allow conference participants to check in the teleconference on the scheduled date and time.

Re claim 18, Cruickshank and Szurkowski disclose all of the limitations of the base claim, but fail to provide a scheduling element including a response module receptive to return information from participants and modifying information in the participant listing accordingly. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Szurkowski to include an editing module to modify information in the participant listing. The motivation is to convey information in regarding to teleconference to the participants with correct address so that information is not sent out to wrong and unauthorized users.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 7 Applicants argue that Cruickshank does not disclose allowing for an individual at a telephone with conferencing capabilities to set up a conference call. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Cruickshank discloses establishing connection between teleconference bridge server and caller's computer through data network (figure 5, element S510). Applicants further argue that the combination of Cruickshank and

Szurkowski does not disclose providing conference call set-up from a communication device that is incapable of performing conference calling via the traditional voice network. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Cruickshank and Szurkowski discloses regarding the use of database technology to provide calling lists (figure 2), scheduling processes (column 3, lines 18-20), and the like. Furthermore, the Examiner respectfully sees this argument as inconsistent with the first argument. Applicants argue first that a communication device has conferencing capability and now argues that it is incapable of performing conference calling. Therefore, the Examiner concludes that the rejection of claims stands.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Cho whose telephone number is 571-272-3087. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 7 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3088.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

hc
Hong Cho
Patent Examiner
9/12/2005


HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600